

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

Amirah Coleman,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MiraMed Revenue Group, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.:1:15-cv-39

**COMPLAINT SEEKING DAMAGES FOR VIOLATION OF
THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**

Introduction

1. This is an action for actual and statutory damages, legal fees and costs pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et. seq* (hereinafter referred to as the “FDCPA”), which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive, and unfair practices. Id.
2. The purpose of the FDCPA is to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses. Id.
3. If a violation occurs, “the FDCPA is a strict liability statute that makes debt collectors liable for violations that are not knowing or intentional.” Donahue vs. Quick Collect, 557 F.3d 755, 758 (7th Cir. 2009).
4. Even a single violation of the FDCPA is sufficient to support liability. Taylor vs. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay, & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232, 1238 (5th Cir. 1997).

Jurisdiction

5. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d).

Venue

6. Venue is proper in this Judicial District.

7. The acts and transactions alleged herein occurred in this Judicial District.
8. The Plaintiff resides in this Judicial District.
9. The Defendant transacts business in this Judicial District.

Parties

10. The Plaintiff, Amirah Coleman, is a natural person.
11. The Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term is defined by § 1692a.
12. The Plaintiff is “any person” as that term is used in 15 U.S.C. § 1692d preface.
13. The Defendant, MiraMed Revenue Group, LLC, (hereinafter referred to as “Defendant”), is a debt collection agency and/or debt purchaser operating from an address at 991 Oak Creek Dr., Lombard, IL 60148.
14. The Defendant is a debt collection agency and the Defendant is licensed by the State of Indiana. *See Exhibit “1” attached hereto.*
15. Defendant regularly attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another.
16. The Defendant regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another that arose out of transactions in which the money, property or services which are the subject of the transactions are primarily for personal, family or household purposes.

Factual Allegations

17. The Defendant is a debt collection agency attempting to collect a debt from Plaintiff.
18. The Plaintiff incurred a debt to that was for primarily for personal, family or household purposes as defined by §1692(a)(5).
19. The debt owed by Plaintiff went into default.
20. After the debt went into default the debt was placed or otherwise transferred to the Defendant for collection.
21. The Plaintiff disputes the debt.
22. The Plaintiff requests that the Defendant cease all further communication on the debt.
23. The Defendant’s collector(s) were employee(s) and/or representative(s) of the Defendant at all times mentioned herein.

24. The Defendant acted at all times mentioned herein through its employee(s) and/or representative(s).
25. On November 6, 2014, the Defendant contacted the Plaintiff via telephone call in an attempt to collect a debt. *See Exhibit "2" attached hereto.*
26. During the November 6, 2014, telephone conversation, the Plaintiff informed the Defendant that she had retained legal representation. *See Exhibit "2" attached hereto.*
27. Additionally, during the November 6, 2014, telephone conversation, the Plaintiff provided the Defendant with her legal counsel's contact information. *See Exhibit "2" attached hereto.*
28. Thus, the Defendant not only had knowledge that the Plaintiff had retained legal counsel, but the Defendant also had the contact information for said counsel.
29. On or about December 15, 2014, the Defendant contacted the Plaintiff again via telephone call in an attempt to collect a debt. *See Exhibit "2" attached hereto.*
30. The Defendant therefore contacted a consumer directly in an attempt to collect a debt despite knowledge that the consumer was represented by legal counsel, in violation of the FDCPA.
31. The Defendant's collection communications are to be interpreted under the "unsophisticated consumer" standard. *See Gammon vs. GC Services, Ltd. Partnership*, 27 F.3d 1254, 1257 (7th Cir. 1994).

**First Claim for Relief:
Violation of the FDCPA**

1. The allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 31 of the complaint are realleged and incorporated herewith by references.
2. The Defendant's acts and omissions constitute a violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d.
3. The Defendant's acts and omissions constitute a violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
4. The Defendant's acts and omissions constitute a violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
5. The Defendant violated the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692c by contacting a consumer in an attempt to collect a debt despite knowledge said consumer was represented by legal counsel.

6. As a result of the above violations of the FDCPA, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for actual damages, statutory damages of \$1,000 per defendant, attorney fees, and costs.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that the Court grant the following:

1. A finding that the Defendant violated the FDCPA and/or an admission from the Defendant that it violated the FDCPA.
2. Actual damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1).
3. Statutory damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A).
4. Reasonable attorneys fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3).
5. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John T. Steinkamp

John T. Steinkamp

John Steinkamp and Associates

Attorney for Plaintiff

5218 S. East Street, Suite E1

Indianapolis, IN 46227

Office: (317) 780-8300

Fax: (317) 217-1320

Email: steinkamplaw@yahoo.com